

I am appalled to learn that Sinclair Broadcasting is forcing all of its TV stations to carry the anti-Kerry documentary as NEWS rather than presenting it as an obviously one-sided piece of political abuse (of clearly prejudicial and of doubtful veracity).

This appears to be another example of the danger of allowing such concentration of ownership of media.

The timing, shortly before the upcoming election is a blatant misuse of the public good.

I always understood that these TV stations are given free use of the airwaves based upon serving the interests of the American Public.

The refusal of Sinclair to be even-handed by showing documentaries of public interest which show BOTH sides of arguments and the promotion as NEWS of unsubstantiated accusations should be grounds for examination of Sinclair's fitness to control such a large proportion of the TV media.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.